



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/355,953	10/07/1999	JUNICHI HIKITA	P806-9020	7155

7590 05/07/2003

ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC  
1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.  
SUITE 400  
WASHINGTON,, DC 20036-5339

EXAMINER

FISCHETTI, JOSEPH A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/355,953	10/07/1999	JUNICHI HIKITA	P806-9020	7155

7590 04/22/2003

NIKAIDO MARMELSTEIN MURRAY AND ORAM  
METROPOLITAN SQUARE  
655 FIFTEENTH STREET NW  
SUITE 330 G STREET LOBBY  
WASHINGTON, DC 200055701

EXAMINER

FISCHETTI, JOSEPH A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SK

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/355,953

Applicant(s)

HIKITA ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph A. Fischetti

Art Unit

3627

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --****Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3 and 9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi et al. in view of Eldridge et al.

Takahashi et al. teach:

Re claim 3:

a first cryptogram the wired logic circuit (col. 2 lines 56-67);

a second cryptogram having memory cells concerned with the use of the card;  
changing means being the command decoder 20;

Re claim 9:

storing means read as memory 100;

first cryptogram the wired logic circuit (col. 2 lines 56-67);

Second cryptogram having memory cells concerned with the use of the card;  
changing means being the command decoder 20;

input means is read as the terminal device when it is being used to initialize the card as set forth in col. 4 lines 52-62.

However Takahashi et al. do not teach a determining means which determines whether changes should be made based upon first and second cryptograms. But,

Art Unit: 3627

Eldridge et al disclose a determining means at 708 and 712 which bases change on an internal password. It would be obvious to modify the device in Takahashi et al. to include an internal determining device which would obviously need to base its determination on the first and second cryptograms because these are the two variables in the system which are subject to manipulation.

The wherein clause is given no weight because there is new structure recited therein and hence is deemed merely functional.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Joseph A. Fischetti at telephone number (703) 305-0731.

*Joseph A. Fischetti*  
*Primary Examiner*  
*3627*